

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) No. 10-20348
)
SHANNON MANESS,)
)
Defendant.)

ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court are Defendant Shannon Maness's ("Maness") November 11, 2011 Motion for Production of Photograph (the "Motion") and the Magistrate Judge's May 25, 2012 Report and Recommendation. (Motion, ECF No. 83.) In its November 16, 2011 Response to the Motion, the Government moved for a protective order prohibiting reproduction or dissemination of any images or identifying information pertaining to the minors in this case. (See ECF No. 84.) Magistrate Judge Diane Vescovo recommended that the Court deny the Motion and grant the Government's motion for a protective order. (Report and Recommendation on Def.'s Motion to Compel and Gov.'s Mot. for Protective Order, ECF No. 103) ("Report").) Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's recommendations, the Court ADOPTS them, DENIES Maness's Motion, and GRANTS the Government's.

Objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report were due by June 8, 2012. Neither Maness nor the Government has objected.

"A district judge must determine de novo any part of a magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). A district court is not required to review—under a de novo or any other standard—those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). The Supreme Court has expressly concluded that a district court should adopt the findings and rulings of the magistrate judge to which no specific objection is filed. Id. at 151. Otherwise, a district court would be forced "to review every issue in every case, no matter how thorough the magistrate's analysis and even if both parties were satisfied with the magistrate's report. . . . [which] would be an inefficient use of judicial resources." Id. at 147-48; accord Javeherpour v. United States, 315 F. App'x 505, 509 (6th Cir. 2009). The parties have not objected to the Magistrate Judge's Report. Thus, the Magistrate Judge's determination "become[s] that of the district court." Arn, 474 U.S. at 151 (citation omitted). The Court ADOPTS the Magistrate Judge's Report, DENIES Maness's Motion, and GRANTS the Government's.

So ordered this 3d day of July, 2012.

s/ Samuel H. Mays, Jr.
SAMUEL H. MAYS, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE